said cruise mode logic control circuit responsive to a plurality of vehicle operating parameters including vehicle speed and accelerator pedal information for providing cruise mode logic output control signals for controlling operation of said electric motor and said combustion engine [.];

said hybrid vehicle operable solely from said electric motor or said combustion engine;

a battery; and,

said combustion engine capable of channeling power to said battery and said wheels.

REMARKS

In order to provide additional subject matter of increased specificity for the Examiner's consideration, Claim 54 has been amended to include further features of the present system.

Notification of allowance of the claims now presented is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Conrad O. Gardner
Registration No.: 22,462
Telephone No.: (206) 544-1058

112

mode of driving, how in the event of an inoperable electric power condition is the I.C. engine started to power the vehicle? It is not understood how selection manually of electric or heat engine manually help in Ellers if the engine isn't running as suggested in the rejection of Claim 36 in paragraph 8 of the Office Letter.

Claims 38, 39, and 41 stand rejected over Ellers in view of Mikyake et.al. Claims 38, 39, and 41 all depend from claim 37 and are believed allowable for the reasons given with respect to Claim 37 above.

The Examiner states that it would be obvious to provide control means, set a time period after a predetermined running state to reduce on/off cycling. There is no delay either suggested or taught by Ellers, in fact the contrary appears to be clearly taught which teaches a mechanical transmission driving an electric motor and a continuously variable torque converter coupled to the ICE. Note especially col. 3, penultimate line through col. 4 line 10 where there is automatic synchronization without any types of time delays during the synchronization process.

Accordingly Ellers doesn't need delays or timing circuits as taught by Miyake et.al.

Claims 39, 40 and 41 further recite certain different time delay parameters and are also as a consequence believed allowable.

Claims 46-49 have been rejected over Kenyon in view of Lynch under 35 USC 103 in paragraph 10 of the Office Letter.

While Lynch et. Al. Shows a clutch 23, no logic circuit is shown in Lynch et. Al. Nor a logic control circuit functioning during disengagement of the clutch as called for specifically in applicant's claim 46. How the teaching of the clutch of Lynch et.al. could be obvious to provide in Kenyon without an accompanying logic circuit to control the clutch is not understood.

Dependant claims 47-49 are allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 46.

There is no hint of how emergency electrical system problems would be handled in either Kenyon or Lynch et.al. Other than calling for a tow.

There is no suggestion of a logic circuit controlling a period of torque transfer in either reference cited in combination against claim 49.

A claim 50 has been added to define more specifically cruise mode operation (see e.g. applicants specification on page 2 beginning at line 16). Nothing in the references of record suggests this cruise mode operation.

A further claim 51 was added to highlight a feature of the present system that the engine is operating continuously operating into the lower speed range to charge the battery when the electric motor is powering the vehicle, this claim being allowable over the art of record.

In view of the above, it is believed this application is in condition for allowance which notice is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Conrad O. Gardner
Registration No.: 22,462
Telephone No.: (206) 544-1058

121 Vine St. #2202
Seattle, WA 98121